

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-42 will be active in the application subsequent to entry of this Amendment.

In the Official Action claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 26-29 were examined and stand rejected while claim 9 is indicated to be allowable. Response is now provided to the various parts of the Official Action in the order presented.

Paragraph 1

The examiner has withdrawn claims 4, 5, 11 and 13-25 from consideration as being improper multiple dependent claims; objection is also raised to claim 10 and all of these claims were not examined on the merits.

In preparing this response the claim dependencies have been amended to comply with U.S. PTO requirements – all multiply dependent claims have been removed. In this process a subset of dependent claims directed to mixtures of liquid crystal compounds deriving from original claims 13-22 are presented as new claims 31-42. Claim 30 is directed to the "such as ..." of original claim 15.

Paragraph 2

Notation R¹ has been corrected to R^{1a}.

Paragraphs 3 and 4

The Examiner objects that claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 27-28 are anticipated by Meyer ('642), especially by the reference compounds represented by formula (140) in Table III of Meyer. Meyer does not disclose any compounds where X (in formula I of applicants' claim 1 and 27 and 28) is S or Se, and is not relevant to the S or Se containing compounds of the present invention in any way. Meyer does disclose benzofurans (i.e. formula I or claim 1 where X is O), but all the benzofurans described in Meyer are at most bi-substituted benzofurans, i.e. there is a maximum of two substitutions on the benzofuran moiety. In contrast claims 1, 27 and 28 of the present invention have been amended to require at least 3 substituents on the benzofuran. The other claims objected

to depend from claim 1. There is no disclosure or suggestion of tri-substituted benzofurans in any of the compounds in Table 3 of Meyer or elsewhere in the reference.

Paragraph 5

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 26-28 are rejected as anticipated by JP-7-179856 especially compound 80 in Table 8 and other compounds represented by formulae in Tables 2-13. As with Meyer the Japanese reference does not describe any compounds where X is S or Se, and is only relevant to the benzofurans covered by claim 1. Again as with Meyer the only benzofurans described in JP '856 are bi-substituted. As noted above claims 1, 27 and 28 of the present invention have been amended to require at least 3 substituents on the benzofuran. Independent claim 26 has been amended in a similar way. There is no mention or suggestion in the Japanese reference of tri-substituted benzofurans.

Paragraphs 6 and 7

The examiner objects to claim 29 as obvious over JP'856 because many of the compounds specifically named are said to be suggested by the reference. To advance prosecution and in the light of this objection the majority of claimed compounds have been deleted. The few remaining are nowhere suggested or taught in the reference.

Paragraph 8

Claim 9 has been left as a dependent claim because it is believed that the amended claim 1 from which it depends is patentable.

Other matters

Claim 5 has been amended to make the claim clearer.

In claim 26 the notation of (IV) is incorrect in the phrase "... (IV) where q is 0, reacting a compound of formula (XIII)..." it should in fact be (iv). The notation (IV) refers to a formula, whereas (iv) refers to the 4th part of the method claim. This has been corrected.

Please see the concurrently filed IDS relating to documents cited in the underlying GB application.

GOODBY, J. et al.
Appl. No. 10/088,679
April 13, 2004

For the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application define inventive subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Arthur R. Crawford
Reg. No. 25,327

ARC:eaw
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100